DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 758 EA 022 273

AUTHOR Murray, Albert
TITLE Administration Planning for Tomorrow.
PUB DATE Sep 90
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association of School Administrators (St. John, New Brunswick, Canada, September 23-25, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; Cooperation; *Educational Change; *Educational Planning; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; School Based Management; *School Restructuring
IDENTIFIERS Canada; Empowerment; United States

ABSTRACT

After defining administrative planning and outlining deficits and gains of the past 20 years in American schooling, this address underlines the necessity for educational restructuring. Specifically, educational leaders need to: (1) gather data determining the status quo and suggest incremental improvements; (2) address new solvable challenges and problems to generate enthusiasm and confidence; and (3) facilitate the infusion of participation, trust, openness, more unified strategies, and a mission relevant to society's expectations. Administrators should also help teachers and support staff develop local ownership and a belief in change by encouraging experimentation, supporting the capacity to undertake and sustain change, and providing adequate time to plan, implement, and adjust to change. According to Albert Shanker, the current education model does not enable the majority of students to be educated. Chester Finn hypothesizes that the last third of this century will see the recasting of education's meaning throughout the entire industrialized world. According to Finn, compulsory education will mean engaging in some form of systematic study until one attains a specified knowledge or skill level, rather than sitting in school a set number of years. There will be numerous delivery systems, and teachers will come from varied backgrounds. Also, reliable modes of assessing learning will be required. Administrative planning will require collaboration, staff empowerment, decentralized decision-making, and completely restructured curriculum and instructional programs. The paper concludes by posing several questions regarding school restructuring. (19 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324758

Canadian Association of School Administrators

Administration Planning for Tomorrow

Albert Murray

September 23 - 25, 1990

Let me begin by telling you why I have accepted the invitation to speak to you this morning.

Firstly, I felt it was important to talk to the leaders in education from across Canada. Education in this country is the most important service we have, is highly decentralized, and requires the expenditure of a fairly large amount of taxpayers' dollars.

The second reason is my long-standing interest in the area of planning for the future. It is a challenge for anyone in a leadership position to try to anticipate future trends and to plan accordingly.

The third reason why I am here is that it is almost impossible to refuse a "request" from Jim Jackson, Superintendent of Schools, Districts #30 and #31, New Brunswick, and a member of the planning committee for this conference.

Before we start talking about planning for the future, we need to look at what planning is. There are numerous definitions in the literature, such as:

-- A process which enables the institution to cope with and adapt to present and future realities.

-- A systematic process which enables the institution to both maintain and change its posture in fulfilling its mission.

-- The leadership aspect of administration.

-- A process enabling redesign and renewal of institutions.

These and other definitions suggest that planning requires a detailed examination of the status quo; i.e., what is the present situation? It also requires us to look at the nature of the organization(s) in which we are functioning. It also entails provision for movement from current to future states and instilling within all the stakeholders a commitment and a willingness to move to the desired change.

EA022273

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Murray
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Present

There can be little doubt there is widespread concern about the quality of education today. Public opinion polls in the United States (Gallup) and in Canada (CEA; Manitoba Education, 1984) reveal that levels of support for education are not optimal, and there is general dissatisfaction with public schools.

The Honourable Tom MacMillan, in his address to the school trustees at their Atlantic Provinces Conference in P.E.I. in January of this year, asked trustees to "consider for a painful moment the hard cold facts." The facts he cited are as follows:

-- A major study prepared by the U. S. Department of Education compared math and science achievements of 24,000 13-year-olds in the United States and five other countries: Canada (specifically New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, and British Columbia), plus South Korea, Ireland, Great Britain, and Spain. Americans scored the lowest in mathematics, and Canadians, along with the Irish, scored the lowest in science.

-- A 1987 Southam Newspaper National Survey found that 8% of all Canadians are totally illiterate -- unable to read or write anything. Another 16% are functionally illiterate.

-- Scholastic Aptitude Tests in the U. S. demonstrate that average scores, based on language and literacy and mathematical criteria, have fallen below scores of 25 years ago.

-- Canadian universities turn out too few scientifically and technically trained people: 6% of American baccalaureates are in engineering, versus 20% in Japan and 37% in West Germany. Three-quarters of all high school graduates lack the preparation to take an introductory college engineering course.

Similarly, Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, in the January issue of the Phi Delta Kappan noted "... that parents and the public in general believe that there is a crisis in public education; they believe it to be a crisis in somebody else's school district -- across town, across the state, across the country." Although we, as educators, may attribute poorer student achievement to things such as poor public relations, a greater number of "at risk" students, family background, integration, etc., Shanker suggests the facts tell a different story. Twenty years of assessment of reading, math, and science by the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) reveal:

-- 25% of high school students drop out and are gone.

-- Few of the students who graduate from high school are ready to do real college-level work or to handle a good job -- only 6% could solve a simple multi-step math problem; only 2.6% could write an acceptable letter to a high school principal advocating a change in school rules; only about 5% of 17-year-olds could grasp a moderately complex paragraph.

-- 55% of secondary students in the U. S. go on to college, but the overwhelming majority will be learning what their European counterparts learned in high school.

-- Few of the non-college bound high school graduates are qualified to get and keep a good job.

-- About one-half of the 17-year-olds still in school could not do much math beyond adding, subtracting, and multiplying with whole numbers, and only 12% of them could arrange a series of simple fractions with simple denominators in the order of size.

Although we may not agree with the "facts" or the "perceptions" as presented, conclusions can be drawn from an analysis of the large number of polls conducted in the U. S. and Canada:

1. Blacks and Hispanics in the U. S. have made great strides in reading and math during the last 20 years. The gap between these groups and whites remains unacceptably large, but it has been narrowed by about half.

2. Students are mastering the basics, and they can read simple material; and they can add, subtract, multiply, and divide whole numbers.

3. There is a strong belief in the importance of education. People believe good schools are a social necessity and that education is crucial to individual success.

4. There is concern about the quality of education in schools. About one-quarter to one-third of the people believe that education has deteriorated since they went to school. Such a perception, when coupled with increased expenditures for education, is not acceptable.

5. Concern about the quality of education is greater at the high school level than at the elementary level. People seem to feel that high schools no longer have a central focus; that insufficient attention is given to

academics; and that high schools are unsuccessful in preparing students for work.

6. People no longer believe that more money is, in itself, the solution to the problem. There remains a considerable willingness to pay for education, but there is also the desire to see that money spent is producing good value.

Jack Bowsher, the former director of education at IBM, has said that, if IBM were producing results comparable to those of our schools -- that is, 25% of their computers were falling off the assembly lines before they reached the end; and, if 90% of the completed ones didn't work 80% of the time -- the last thing in the world the company would do would be to run the same old assembly line an additional hour each day or an extra month each year. Instead, IBM would rethink the entire production process. Similarly, what is needed in education to address these concerns is a rethinking of the process, based on both the evidence about results and political necessities.

To continue to operate without change, when a sizable portion of our stakeholders do not have faith in the direction we are heading, is simply unacceptable. We, as leaders in education must recognize that legitimate concerns exist, and we must put forth a program to allay those concerns.

Change

The greatest stimulus for change that we know is pain. From the comments made by Shanker and MacMillan, I sense that there is sufficient "pain" in our educational system to suggest change is necessary. The Carnegie Report on the Teaching Profession, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st. Century" puts the situation starkly: "If our standard of living is to be maintained, if the growth of a permanent underclass is to be averted, if democracy is to function into the next century, our schools must graduate the vast majority of their students with achievement levels long thought possible for only the privileged few."

It is almost axiomatic that, if education is going to improve, change is inevitable. To better adapt to these changes and avoid the overuse and/or inflexible use of defence mechanisms, we, as leaders in education, need to:

1. Gather data to determine the status quo and suggest improvements that can be adopted incrementally.

2. Address new challenges and problems which are solvable so that enthusiasm and confidence are generated.

3. Arrange for the infusions of participation, trust, openness, more unified strategies, and a sense of

mission that is relevant to the expectations of society.

Teachers and support staff, generally, dislike the idea of change. Leaders need to play a major role in changing their attitudes. This may be accomplished, in part, by the following:

1. Develop local ownership and a belief in the change by involving teachers and support staff, as well as other stakeholders in the change from the very beginning.

2. Encourage experimentation and variety since we do not know with any certainty what works.

3. Develop and support the capacity (skills, knowledge, concepts) to undertake and sustain change in all levels of the education system, especially among teachers.

4. Provide adequate time to plan, implement, and adjust to change.

5. Recognize quality within the system, through appropriate publicity and awards.

In Shanker's article, which I mention earlier, he refers to an article in The Wall Street Journal which, at first, he thought was a Polish joke but was actually an interview with a Polish economist. Shanker suggests that it is also an American education joke.

The reporter who interviewed the economist about economic conditions in Poland asked, "Do you think it's really possible to lift the Polish economy from this terrible state of poverty to a state of prosperity?" The Polish economist answered, "Yes, I think it is. As a matter of fact, there are two ways to do it. There is a natural way and a miraculous way." The reporter asked, "Well, all right, what's the natural way?" "The natural way," said the economist, "would be for a band of angels to descend from heaven and lift Poland into prosperity." "If that's the natural way," the reporter asked, "what's the miraculous way?" To which the economist replied, "The miraculous way would be if the Poles did it themselves."

If we are going to change the direction of public education, we must do it ourselves, as there is no band of angels to lift our schools into effectiveness.

Organizations

In the modern world, organizations are the principal mechanism which societies use to "get things done," to achieve goals that are beyond the grasp of individuals. Like citizens,

organizations can act, enter into contracts, use resources, and own property.

In addition to doing things for and in society, organizations do things to society. They are, increasingly, seen as the sources of many of the ills of society. In the past, organizations have been criticized for being overly active in planning, ordering, and managing our lives; and causing alienation, overconformity, and the stunting of personal growth. Today, they are recognized as having a greater effect on society. The very goals -- products and services -- that society uses organizations to achieve are shaped by organizations used to achieve them. For example, (Skrtic, unpublished):

> In his crucial decision on how to react to the installation of Russian missiles in Cuba, President Kennedy had to select from a naval blockade, a "surgical" air strike, and a massive land invasion, not because these were the only conceivable responses, but because these were the principal organizational routines which had been worked out by the pentagon.

Another example:

> Although we seek "health" when we visit the clinic or hospital, what we get is "medical care." Clients are encouraged to view these outputs as synonymous, although there may be no relation between them. In some cases, the relation can even be negative: more care can result in poorer health.

Historically, the study of organizations, including schools, can simply be thought of as progressing over three overlapping periods and corresponding schools of thought: the classical period, the human relations period, and theory movement.

During the first part of this century, the classical period, the focus was on standardizing the process and bringing work under the formal control of leaders. The goal was "efficiency." School administrators, during this period, took their lead from scientific managers. They, too, emphasized efficiency. School organization and management was analyzed much in the same way as was work in the factory. The efficiency mentality fit quite well with the then-dominant view of teaching as repeated, routinized drill and practice and with the perceived purpose of schools as that of mass-producing education.

The human relations era began in the 1920s and came to prominence in the 1940s. The message was that worker behaviour was determined by the norms, values, and sentiments of the informal structure and not to the official specifications of the organization. Proponents of the human relations era attempted to replace the classical notion of man as a machine with increased

attention to worker relations, satisfaction, and motivation. In the 1940s and 1950s, the human relations era translated into education as "democratic practices" -- democratic teaching, democratic supervision, democratic decision-making, and democratic administration.

The human relations era was short-lived, giving way initially to a synthesis of the classical and human relations perspectives and then to the theory movement. The notions of "rationality" and "efficiency" contained in Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy which appeared at this time were what was needed to launch the theory movement into the academic disciplines. In the late 1950s, the leading professors sought to orient education by formally adopting the new field of organizational theory as a discipline. For a number of reasons, this attempt to ground the educational administration in the field of organizational theory failed. As a result, the field of educational administration -- in terms of school organization and management, the training of administrators, and the practices of school leaders -- remains today essentially as it did almost forty years ago.

Shanker contends that this rigid and confining structure of our traditional model of education does not enable the majority of students to be educated.

Shanker also contends that we've reached the limits of what the traditional model of education will yield. Our situation in education is similar to the one the auto makers found themselves in several years ago. They, too, were producing more and better cars in 1980 than they were in 1950. But doing better than in the past wasn't good enough because the Japanese were still doing better. Faced with falling sales, auto makers (like educators) thought their problems were just a matter of poor workers who needed to be fired or told exactly what to do and made to work harder. The auto makers, too, complained about lousy raw materials and poor public relations. It was not until they examined the Japanese systems of production and management that they began to see they had to restructure their system. And when they saw the first-rate results which Toyota achieved when it reopened a failed American auto plant in California, with a different production process, different relations between workers and managers, a different auto design, and the very same poor raw materials and recalcitrant union workers, the revelation was amazing.

Chester E. Finn, Jr., in his article in the Phi Delta Kappan of April, 1990, entitled "The Biggest Reform of Them All" hypothesizes that the last third of this century will be viewed as a time when the very meaning of education was recast throughout the industrial world. Under the old paradigm, education is thought of as process and system, effort and intention, investment and hope. To improve education meant to try harder, to engage in more activity, to increase one's plans, and to become more efficient in delivering them. Under the new

definition which is emerging, education is seen as the results achieved, the learning which takes place when the process has been effective. Only if the person succeeds and learning takes place will we say that education has taken place. In the absence of evidence of such a result, there is no education, regardless of how many attempts have been made, resources deployed, or energies depleted.

Questioning of the input-and-process definition of education probably began with the Coleman report in the mid-sixties. Reflecting back on the study, Coleman wrote:

> The major virtue of the study as conceived and executed lay in the fact that it did not accept the traditional definition and by refusing to do so has had its major impact in shifting policy attention from the traditional focus of comparison of inputs (the traditional measures of school quality used by school administrators: per pupil expenditures, class size, teacher salaries, age of building and equipment, and so on) to a focus on output, and the effectiveness of inputs for bringing about these changes in outputs.

The old paradigm has not scorned cognitive learning or other kinds of outcomes but poses that a direct and automatic causal relationship exists between inputs and outcomes and that altering the former inevitably changed the latter. Coleman, however, suggests that they were not firmly joined together at all. The "effective schools" research of Rutter, Edmonds, Lezotte, and others reinforced Coleman's beliefs.

Finn suggests the following possibilities, if we change our definition of education:

-- Compulsory education will mean engaging in some form of systematic study until one attains a specified level of knowledge and skill, rather than sitting in school a set number of years.

-- There will be an array of delivery systems ranging from home computers to workplace experiences to electronic links between distant locations.

-- Teachers will come from varied backgrounds in terms of training and experience.

-- The definition of a school year and a school day will evaporate as the obligation to study is tied to outcome levels rather than to a fixed number of years of effort.

-- The range of materials and mechanisms by which one can legitimately learn and study will expand rapidly (VCR,

audio tape, computer, seminar in public library, tutorial, reading a paperback/newspaper).

-- Reliable and valid modes of assessing learning will be required.

-- Outcomes will have to be defined very carefully, and steps taken to ensure that the "minimum" does not become the "maximum."

Administrative Planning

Thus far, I have attempted to describe the status quo in relation to how education is perceived; outline the need for change; and briefly talked about the nature of organizations and the emerging definition of education. What does this mean for us as individuals in leadership positions in education?

The changing scene necessitates that we change from our perceived role of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling to one of motivating, collaborating, and leading the people with whom we work. There is a need to: consider participatory decision-making and teacher leadership; rethink curricular and instructional efforts; and examine the amount and the manner of the participation of parents and the community. I believe we have to examine the areas of collaboration, empowerment, site-based management, and curriculum planning. I would like to briefly comment on each.

Collaboration

Collaboration is seldom mentioned in the effective schools literature, nor is it part of the vocabulary of the recent studies on American education. Yet, evidence is accumulating that the nature of relationships among individuals who work in an organization has a tremendous influence on the quality and character of the organization and the achievement of its goals and objectives. Collaborative relationships have both a vertical and a horizontal dimension. That is, leaders cooperate with the individual members, and individual members cooperate with one another.

To many, the term collaboration brings to mind the idea of school administrators sharing their authority with teachers and involving them in decisions. This is an important focus of the collaborative approach to schooling, but its more important dynamic comes from teachers working together to improve their practice of teaching. It is the interaction among teachers about instruction that distinguishes the collaborative approach from earlier models of democratic management and participative decision-making.

The collaborative approach emphasizes the involvement of teachers because of their professional status. Teacher expertise

is sought in formulating goals, and teachers are free, for the most part, to exercise their professional judgment in implementing these goals. The collaborative approach encourages staff members to work together as professionals and with administrators toward improvement and professional growth.

Many schools have a structure and an accompanying set of social norms that isolate teachers from one another. They also have a bureaucratic management style which alienates teachers from administrators. Smith and Scott (1990) cite a number of methods for effective structures which can be used to improve collaboration with and among teachers. They include:

1. School Improvement Teams -- teachers and administrators work together as teams to develop programs of school improvement.

2. Program Evaluation by Teachers -- teachers play a major role in evaluating the education program of the school (setting objectives, implementing, evaluation).

3. Peer Observation -- formative.

4. Quality Circles and Peer Coaching.

5. Mentorship Programs.

6. Teacher Support Team -- provide both one-on-one and group support depending on the needs of the teacher. The principal is a member of the support team.

Empowerment

Peters and Waterman in "In Search of Excellence" found two common factors present in successful companies -- autonomy and entrepreneurship. They found successful companies encourage the entrepreneural spirit because they push autonomy way down the line. IBM was cited by them as one company in which most new products came from people who worked on their own ideas or went off to work on their own. IBM went so far as to provide recognition and funding for this purpose.

Peter Drucker described a similar phenomena in "Innovation and Entrepreneurship":

> Entrepreneural companies always look for the people and units that do better and do differently. They single them out, feature them, and constantly ask them: What are you doing that explains your success?

Lieberman and Miller may have said it best in "Teachers, Their World and Their Work":

> Finally, we want to express a point of view that goes against current wisdom. Principals are important; they may

even be critical. But they are not the only initiators and supporters of change. Leadership is interactive. A school shapes a principal as much as a principal shapes a school. Making improvements does not depend upon one person, one variable, one idea.

What is being suggested by these authors is a word very popular in today's school reform efforts -- empowerment -- people working together to empower each other so that all have a share in the movement and direction of the organization. There are two types of empowerment: organizational empowerment, which is reinforced by policy and management procedures, and personal empowerment, which is a product of the individuals themselves. Organizational empowerment starts with the superintendent, principals, and school board and entails keeping people well informed and involved in decisions. Personal empowerment starts with the individual and requires one to participate in personal and professional development activities, develop good communication skills, and be willing to take risks.

One of the questions often raised in discussion of empowerment is: "Does teacher empowerment mean less power for the principal or those in leadership positions?" The simple answer is that empowerment is based on the vision that power shared is power multiplied. Teacher empowerment does not mean, "You've got this power and I want it, so I'm going to take it from you." It may mean, with teachers, that they have the power to set the daily schedule; they have the power to regroup children from class to class within a team of teachers; they have the power to select materials; and it may mean they have the power to make the necessary adjustment and changes for students within their team to reach their goals. They may also be involved in mentoring and coaching of other teachers; appraising the performance of other teachers; or building-level decision-making. These changes may result in some power shifts where decisions are made at the teacher level rather than at the principal or district level as before.

A recent booklet on Empowerment distributed by AASA (1990) makes numerous suggestions to enable principals, superintendents, and district office staff to empower teachers. They include:

-- Involving staff in the development of a vision for the schools.

-- Keeping everyone well informed about school and district issues, concerns, and procedures.

-- Involving teachers in discussing budget, staffing, curriculum, and other issues.

-- Recognizing all staff as professionals who are dedicated to helping students learn.

-- Providing opportunities for teachers to work together and to share, both at the school and district level.

-- Supporting innovation and risk-taking.

-- Focusing public attention on the accomplishments of students, teachers, and other school staff.

-- Establishing school-based management systems that allow individual schools a strong voice in budget, personnel, and other decisions that bear on education.

The road to empowerment is not smooth. To truly empower individuals, leaders must move the decision-making beyond the mundane to the important aspects of teaching and learning and make provisions for teachers to feel secure and to know that their decisions will make a difference.

Site-Based Management

School site-based management is a new name for an old concept -- the concept that decisions should be made at the lowest level possible, preferably where they can lead to solutions. Custodial decisions should be made by custodians; instructional decisions by classroom teachers; and school-wide decisions by principals. Some proponents of school site-based management suggest that no decisions should be made without input from those affected by them.

Merely pushing decisions down to the school level, however, will do little in the absence of a complete rethinking of how the roles of teachers, administrators, and others must change to take advantage of the new freedoms and responsibilities. The roles of the teachers and the principal in school site-based management need to be understood and accepted by all the participants. It is crucial to develop a sense of trust in order to establish a credible framework of self-governance, an integral part of school site-based management. It takes time to establish new rules, define new roles, and balance new relationships. The "new" governing process must be painstakingly adhered to, and new methods of communication must be developed and used.

More than anything else, school site-based management is a philosophy of governing or a way of thinking about governance. Several programs have been implemented in schools and are working well. School site-based management enables teachers to find assistance and support for adjusting classroom organization, instructional strategies, and curriculum to enable them to reach their goals of student achievement. This approach permits schools to provide for increased student learning and for teachers to facilitate and accept responsibility. School site-based management and new decision-making structures should not be seen as ends in themselves but as means to achieve more effective environments for teaching and learning.

Curriculum and Instruction

The cornerstone of restructuring is a rethinking of our curricular and instructional efforts in order to promote quality and equality for all students. Lieberman and Miller (1990) suggest that this implies a systematic questioning of all our current instructional practices and a willingness to modify -- even in some cases to eliminate -- basic tenets that we now hold about what learning is and how it can be promoted for all students. The kind of practices to be addressed include sorting children by age into grade levels, tracking, the organization of the academics, definitions of student achievement, and the criteria by which we judge an educated person.

Finn (1990) mentions "the textbook" as an example of a practice that we have continued over a long period of time but has not resulted in a solution. He notes that pressuring publishers, authors, and curriculum committees has resulted in only minor changes in textbooks and contends they still are big, boring, full of unrelated bits of information, lacking in ideas, and practically inert with respect to reasoning skills. His concern is heightened by the fact that so much of what students study and the strategies used in teaching are influenced by the textbook, and results show that students are not learning as much as they should.

As previously suggested, our definition of education is changing from one of covering content and inputs to one of what is learned. We now have to be very precise and clear about what it is students must learn. This will translate into: having sound curricula that relate to what we really want students to learn and having teachers who have mastered that content, as well as diverse ways of imparting it through a range of teaching strategies and materials. The textbook, if used at all, will be a reference book, rather than the embodiment of the entire course in one volume.

Anne Lewis (1990) notes that no area of the curriculum has escaped the attentions of current reformers. The attention has centred mostly on providing richer, more challenging content, rather than additional courses or coverage. Some trends are evident:

-- Textbook content must be enlivened.

-- Teaching should rely less on basal readers and textbooks and more on supplementary resources.

-- The emphasis should be on "essential" learning, with mastery of the subject the guiding measurement of students, rather than hours in class.

-- Curriculum should be more context related; for example, hands-on experiences in science or the solving of real community problems in social studies.

-- The curriculum should be interdisciplinary, especially in secondary schools.

-- The curriculum should stimulate critical thinking, discussion, problem solving; in other words, it should engage students in active, rather than passive, learning.

Numerous school reformers have advocated that there needs to be an emphasis on higher-order thinking skills, the broader use of a variety of learning experiences, a greater emphasis on thoughtful work and classrooms where students take responsibility for their learning and where teachers are "coaches" rather than "tellers." Pressure is being applied for central authority and politicians to develop a common curriculum and monitor student results. Such a move would be contrary to the whole notion of restructuring which connotes a movement toward open and accountable education where decisions are made as a result of a shared decision-making process, rather than imposed from above.

Conclusion

When we embark on a new project, we generally devote a great deal of time to defining goals and objectives. But the reality of implementation is messy and uncomfortable. Generally, people buy into an idea they may not know much about because they care about the underlying values. However, when the idea is implemented, more ideas regarding what needs to be done are generated, the necessary supports are more clearly known, the problems which are likely to arise are identified, and what future directions are appropriate become more apparent.

When planning for the restructuring of schools, a wealth of questions are raised:

-- How long does it take to build staff cohesion around an idea for restructuring school?

-- Is it better to do something immediately, or is it more appropriate first to spend time learning to communicate with one another and to make decisions together?

-- Can staff members learn to trust one another while they are engaged in curricular change?

-- Where does the necessary knowledge for restructuring come from?

-- How do staff members learn to work together as the vision unfolds?

-- Is it more important to have a plan or a process?

I suggest that there are no sure-fire answers to these questions. As we approach restructuring in a variety of ways, the process is not predictable nor orderly, but fitful and pragmatic. Most of us have little experience with transforming big ideas into workable practices without losing the essence of the ideas. Working through such complicated issues as establishing democracy in the workplace, developing colleagiality, and expanding responsibilities for teachers and students is complex. There is no road map. However, these are the emerging issues with which superintendents, administrators, teachers, students, and parents must deal.

It is crucial to remember that the ultimate goal of restructuring is to make schooling better for children. Procedures are important, but they must support basic principles and values about learning and teaching. Restructuring is not an end in itself but a means to a richer, more engaging education for the young.

REFERENCES

Berry, Barnet and Rick Ginsberg:
1990 "Creating Lead Teachers: From Policy to Implementation." Phi Delta Kappan, (April): 616-21.

Brandt, Ron:
1990 "On Restructuring Schools: A Conversation With Al Shanker." Educational Leadership, (April): 11-16.

Conley, Sharon and Samuel Bacharach:
1990 "From School-Site Management to Participatory School-Site Management." Phi Delta Kappan, (March): 539-44.

Finn, Chester, Jr.
1990 "The Biggest Reform of All." Phi Delta Kappan, (April): 584-92.

Foster, Karen
1990 "Small Steps on the Way to Teacher Empowerment." Educational Leadership, (May): 38-41.

Glickman, Carl
1990 "Open Accountability for the 90's: Between The Pillars." Educational Leadership, (April): 38-42.

Herzog, Susan:
1990 A New Look at Empowerment. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

Kets de Vries, Manfred F. R. and Danny Miller
1987 Ustable at the Top. New York: N al Penguin Inc.

Koerner, Thomas F., ed.
1989 "School-Site Management." The Practitioner, (December): 1-6. National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Koslofsky, Norman
1989 "Garbage Cans and Growth Environments: How Schools Really Work." Clearing House (December): 153-55.

Leiberman, Ann and Lynne Miller
1990 "Restructuring Schools: What Matters and What Works." Phi Delta Kappan, (June): 759-64.

Levin, Benjamin
1986 "Improving the Quality of Education: An Alternative Approach." The Canadian Administrator, (March): 1-4.

Lewis, Anne
1989 Restructuring America's Schools. Arlington: American Association of School Administrators.

McMillan, Honourable Tom
1990 An Address to the Atlantic Provinces School Trustees Conference. Charlottetown: (January).

O'Neil, John
1990 "Piecing Together the Restructuring Puzzle." Educational Leadership, (April): 4-10.

Shanker, Albert
1990 "A Proposal for Using Incentives to Restructure Our Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, (January): 345-57.

Skrtic, Tom
The Organizational Context of Special Education. Unpublished.

Smith, Stuart C. and James J. Scott
1990 The Collaborative School. Reston: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Watson, Dan and Punky Fristom
1990 "Empowerment and the Collaboration Leader." The Clearing House, (April): 362-62.